

Interpellation.

6. (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the principle on which tariff rates have been fixed for cocoanut oil at Rs. 18-12 per cwt. and for copra at Rs. 22-8 per cwt. for the purpose of levying an export duty of 5 per cent, and also their market prices at present?

(b) If the tariff rate as fixed at present for copra is Rs. 22-8 per cwt. then the tariff rate for cocoanut oil ought to be Rs. 38 to 39, as about 1½ cwt. of copra are required to yield one cwt. of oil. If so, is not the present rate for cocoanut oil a source of great loss to the Government in the collection of duty?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to fix the tariff rates of copra and cocoanut oil proportionately with a view to collect the due duty accurately and help the majority of the agriculturists of the State who are now great losers by underselling their cocoanuts on the present miscalculated tariff rate?

Mr. G. Parameswaran Pillai.

7. (a) Will the Government be pleased to state what steps, if any, have been taken by them towards the medical inspection of college students and school children and with what results?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state whether they do not think it necessary to conduct an inquiry into the health and physique of the school-going population as a preliminary to introducing a complete system of periodical medical inspection?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to direct the Education Department to institute inquiries and report on the effects on the health of school children, of the present hours of working, courses of study, the number of text books, and absence of facilities for outdoor games, with special reference to Elementary Schools?

8. (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether the Remission Rules dated 28th June 1914, as amended by Notifications Nos. 2678 of 15th April 1919 and 100 of 10th January 1920, alone govern the grant of seasonal remissions; and, if not, to place on the table any other orders on the subject, and to define the policy of Government underlying the grant of seasonal remissions?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a pakuthiwar statement showing the grant of such remissions in the Neyyattinkara taluk during the years 1093, 1094 and 1095, and if no such remissions have been granted, to state whether applications for the grant of remissions under Schedule I of the Rules were not received during the period?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state whether in view of Rule (3), (1) of the Remission Rules, remissions are granted when there is a total failure of crops either on account of drought (*karivu*) or through the destructive action of excessive floods?

Answer.

6. (a), (b) & (c). Tariff values are generally based on market rates. In the case of cocoanut oil, the tariff value fixed is no doubt far below the market rate, but it has been so fixed intentionally with a view to encourage oil extraction industry in the State. The matter will be re-examined.

7. (a), (b) & (c). The question of providing for the medical inspection of students in educational institutions is engaging the attention of Government.

Chief Secretary Mr. N. Rajaram Rao.

8. (a) The Rules referred to are the only ones governing the grant of seasonal remissions. The policy underlying the grant of such remissions is explained in the Rules themselves. (*Vide* pages 1201 and 1202, Vol. II, Land Revenue Manual.)

(b) The information is laid on the table.

(c) Remissions are granted only in cases of total failure of crops on account of drought.

Interpellation.

(d) If the present Rules do not admit of remissions being granted for complete loss by excessive floods, will the Government be pleased to extend the scope of the Remission Rules and grant such remissions where they are satisfied that there has been *total* failure of crops on account of excessive floods of extraordinary nature?

(e) Will the Government be pleased to state whether any representations were made to them or to the Revenue Department by the ryots of Chenkal pakuthi, Neyyattinkara taluk, for the remission of tax for the Kanni crop of 1936, on account of total failure of crops caused by the destructive action of extraordinary floods, and, if so, what action, if any, has been taken thereon by Government or the Department concerned?

(f) Will the Government be pleased to institute a special inquiry into the grievances of the ryots of Chenkal pakuthi and grant them remission for the Kanni crop of 1936, and carry out any works that may be required to mitigate the effect of the floods on the wet lands?

9. Will the Government be pleased to appoint a Committee to inquire into and report upon the necessity for establishing a State Bank in Travancore, with a view to expanding the existing indigenous banking facilities, to consolidate and make secure the transactions of the various banks in the State and to provide adequate capital for the industrial and agricultural development of the State?

Mr. M. Subrahmanya Pillai.

10. (i) The Government, in reply to my question No. III asked in the Council meeting held on the 27th July 1920, have stated that tank-beds to the extent of 90 acres and 40 cents have been registered in favour of individuals since the completion of the Kodayar Project. Will they now be pleased to state whether it includes the Mankulam tank-bed in the Eesantimangalam pakuthi, Tovala taluk?

(ii) Will the Government be pleased to state whether Mr. N. Raman Pillai B. A., retired Dewan Peishkar and the present owner, had, while in office, any hand in fixing the *tharam* of this tank-bed for the purpose of the assessment of tax, and whether the Government have shown him any concession in fixing the price, and, if so, what that price per acre was?

(iii) Are the Government aware that Mr. N. Ramaswami Pillai of Bhoothapandi, while in active service, had put in an application to the Government, dated Bagdad, 12th

Answer.

(d) The existing rule does not contemplate the grant of remission for loss of crop on account of excessive floods in individual fields, but in practice Government have been granting such remissions for widespread loss of crops due to excessive floods.

(e) A petition dated the 8th Karkadakam 1935, was received by Government from Trivikraman Velayudhan and others of Chenkal pakuthi, Neyyattinkara taluk, praying for the remission of the tax for the Kanni crop of 1936, on about 205 paras of wet lands in the pakuthi, on account of loss of the crop due to excess of rain, and it was forwarded for disposal to the Dewan Peishkar, Trivandrum, on the 12th Kanni 1936. Five applications for remission in the same connection were also received by the Tahsildar and they were rejected as remission could not be granted under the Remission Rules.

(f) The Government see no reason for instituting a special inquiry, the Peishkar being competent to move the Government for grant of remission if there is justification for it. In regard to the protective works referred to, if specific representations are made, they will receive consideration.

Financial Secretary Mr. K. George.

9. The question of deputing an officer to study and report on the working of the State banks in Mysore and Baroda is under the consideration of Government.

Chief Secretary Mr. N. Rajaram Rao.

10. (i) Yes.

(ii) No. The *tharam* was fixed by Government. The price was fixed by the Dewan at Rs. 250 per acre after personal inspection of the land.

(iii) Two applications were received from Mr. Ramaswami Pillai referred to and they were forwarded to the Dewan Peishkar.